



City of Seattle  
Seattle Department of Neighborhoods  
Bernie Matsuno, Director

## **SWEDISH MEDICAL CENTER CHERRY HILL CAMPUS MAJOR INSTITUTIONS MASTER PLAN CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

### **SWEDISH MEDICAL CENTER CHERRY HILL CAMPUS MAJOR INSTITUTIONS MASTER PLAN CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

#### **Committee Members**

Najwa Alsheikh, Chair

Patrick Carter

Andrew Coates

Dylan Glosecki

Maja Hadlock

Joy Jacobson

Eric J. Oliner

J. Elliot Smith

Laurel Spelman

Mark Tilbe

Jamile Mack

*Swedish Medical  
Center Non-  
management  
Representative*

Nicholas Richter

#### **Committee Alternates**

David Letrondo

#### **Ex-officio Members**

Steve Sheppard

*Department of  
Neighborhoods*

Stephanie Haines

*Department of  
Planning and  
Development*

Marcia Peterson

*Swedish Medical  
Center Management*

Cristina Van Valkenburgh

*Seattle Department of  
Transportation*

### **DRAFT Meeting Notes**

#### **Meeting #7**

**July 18, 2013**

Swedish Medical Center

Swedish Education & Conference Center

550 17th Avenue

First Floor - James Tower

#### **Members and Alternates Present**

Najwa Alsheikh,

Andrew Coates

Laurel Spelman

Patrick Carter

Dylan Glosecki

Maja Hadlock

David Letrondo

Nicholas Richter

#### **Members and Alternates Present**

Jamile Mack

Eric Oliner

J. Elliot Smith

Mark Tilbe

#### **Ex-Officio Members Present**

Steve Sheppard, DON

Marcia Peterson, SMC

Stephanie Haines, DPD

Christina Van Valkenburgh, SDOT

*(See sign-in sheet)*

#### **I. Welcome and Introductions**

Najwa Alsheikh opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

#### **II. Housekeeping – Approval of Agenda**

The agenda was modified to include a discussion of revisions to the number of alternatives. She noted that several of the previous alternatives have been dropped from further consideration.

#### **III. Election of Committee Co-Chair**

Ms. Alsheikh mentioned that Cynthia started as a committee chair but had to step down. She noted that the election of a new co-chair is on the agenda and that an email was sent to members concerning this vote. Steve Sheppard from the Department of Neighborhoods then briefly summarized the duties of the co-chair. Ms. Alsheikh then asked for volunteers or nominations. Committee members declined to vote at the meeting and requested that this vote be postponed until the next meeting; all agreed. Ms. Alsheikh emphasized that the election has already been postponed once and urged action on this item at the next meeting.

#### **IV. Alternatives No Longer under Consideration (added to the agenda)**

Marcia Peterson from Swedish Medical Center informed the committee

that SMC had determined that several of the alternatives previously discussed will no longer be under consideration. She noted that this was in part due to feedback from the committee and public comment. Previous alternatives that will no longer be considered include: Alternate 3 (which is de-compress growth which expands out beyond the current boundary to the 19<sup>th</sup> and that goes up to the North and to the South) and also Alternate 4 (which expands onto the DSHS site). With these options not advancing, this reduces the number of EIS has to cover to #3, #5, and #6.

Ms. Peterson noted that Alternative #3 includes the vacation of both. 16<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup>, #5 vacates 16<sup>th</sup> and includes a couple of sky bridges across 18<sup>th</sup>, and # 6 also includes a street vacation.

Dylan Glosecki suggested that there be an alternative that included no street vacations. David Chamness with Callison Architects responded that the vacation of 16<sup>th</sup> relates to the function of the emergency department. This is critical to the future emergency department and how the ambulances access the emergency department. After brief further discussion the Committee expressed general support for inclusion of an option an option of including no street vacations.

Nicholas Richter would like to see 16<sup>th</sup> avenue maintain pedestrian activity to the building through open connections, and if there is a vacation, it is fine as long as it includes in all of the options and pedestrian activity is emphasized.

#### **IV. Discussion of Design Elements**

Najwa Alsheikh noted that members had requested time to consider possible design elements that they believed might help soften or mitigate some of the impacts of the proposed campus development on the neighborhood. Dylan Glosecki had taken this opportunity to put together a series of images of both positive and negative elements at the SMC Cherry Hill and other nearby institutions. Mr. Glowecki was given the floor to present these images.

Mr. Glosecki noted that the objectives of these images is to facilitate discussion about what type of pedestrian amenities that Swedish can add as it further developed its campus and interact more with the surrounding neighborhood. This is an informal presentation. The committee would like gather ideas on what Swedish can develop going forward.

*Editor's Note: The presentation related to slides and was not easily converted into written form.*

Images shown were:

1. Group Health on 15<sup>th</sup> – interior plaza connected with pedestrian access.
  - a. Showing retail spaces – gets pedestrian trail, interacts with campus.
2. Seattle U's corner – open space plaza, shaded trees, playgrounds, play space.
3. Street furniture at the street level
4. Current view of Swedish campus – does not feel welcoming
5. Current view of the current pedestrian connector to the campus

Ms. Alsheikh opened the floor to discussion. She stated that she would take comments and questions from both the Committee and public related to the slide presentation.

#### Public Comments/Questions Concerning Design Elements

Mary Pat noted that there were no people on these photos; which suggests that these spaces are not a huge demand. How many people go to the pizza parlors, nail salons on 12<sup>th</sup>, maybe they are not beneficial? Dylan responded that it is a very good point, the pictures were taken in the morning where people are at work 10-10:30am and it is not a common time where the public is visible will take new pictures where people are more visible. Dylan mentioned that these spaces are very important and it does have a lot of uses.

Ken Stangland responded that he lives on 16<sup>th</sup> and uses these spaces a lot. He uses the park/pedestrian pass way, but it closes down very early. I would like to see these spaces open so people can use them basically 24 hours a day.

Vicki Schianterelli noted that inclusion of upper decks, open spaces or viewpoints on the upper deck of any building along 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue would present a problem for anyone on her block as a lot of folks might be staring at my backyard. She also noted that more thought will need to be given to the rear of buildings, and again especially anything constructed with its frontage on the east side of 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue. There will need to be considerably more innovations so that we can live in harmony with the major institution. Dylan responded that right now, we are doing some brainstorm ideas; we are not proposing anything want some feedback from the community to take to Swedish. Vicki noted that she would like to have more opportunities to be involved in these discussions.

Bob Cooper stated that he lives on 16<sup>th</sup> south of the campus and that the small park in that area is used regularly. If there were more green spaces and plaza space at grade, it would definitely be used more often. He also noted that any pedestrian connector would need much better signage.

Eileen DeArmon stated tht SMC is proposing that there be a future Design Workshop to discuss and gather input from neighbors about what do you most value in your neighborhood. We would like to have an interactive discussion. No date has been set, but it should be relatively soon. Steve Sheppard stated that the committee should co-sponsor this event. He noted that Virginia Mason did this, that it was open to the public and proved very useful. The committee decided to schedule it at the end of summer so people can do more planning, build communications, schedule facilitators and architects.

#### Committee Comments/Questions Concerning Design Elements:

Najwa Alsheikh noted that she was concerned 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue remains accessible to people regardless of whether it is vacated. There are spaces designated as public spaces but it is barren. I would like to see a well designed public walkway.

Members commented that the campus currently feels a fortress-like and turns its back on the community. From Jefferson, it is neither accessible, nor can you see the entrance. There should be more landscaping and less concrete. They stated that neighborhood would benefit greatly if Swedish provided better pedestrian/biking connections or if there were an effort to create a Greenway (enhanced streets) that goes through the 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Others

opined that public amenities and small shops would be desirable along portions of the MIO boundary.

Andrew Coats stated that he would like to focus on the 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue and would like to see how the emergency vehicles will be coming in and out and understand the design elements. Andrew would like to have a lot of information from the architects and bring those information and different alternatives to the committee.

## **V. General Public Comments**

**Comments of Murray Anderson** – Mr. Anderson stated that he lives across the street from Jefferson and wanted to second the need to have more variety and interest along that side of the campus. Street level life is important. He also expressed concerns regarding the vacation of 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue and especially how it might be configured. Would there be any public access for continued entry to the garage or would it be primarily used for emergency vehicles only? Is there some way the street can be configured as a one lane one way so half of the street can be a walking plaza? He also noted that the design of 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue might be crucial to neighborhood acceptance of this level of development. Mr. Anderson also asked for clarification on ownership patterns and specifically which buildings are owned by SMC and which by Sabey. He offered the suggestion that SMC uses displace other leased space in the Sabey building. He noted that the total level of development is great and that if the neighborhood is being asked to accept this it should be clear that it is SMC uses and not for Sabey leasors. Is this a part of Swedish; or a ploy by Sabey just to build office buildings?

**Response:** Marcia Peterson responded that the programs SMC would build will be supporting the campus. There is no intention of turning these new buildings into a general hospital; its focus will be on specialties like the Heart Center and Neuroscience. Natalie Price noted that the information about the buildings is at the Swedish website. There is an updated FAQ's posted on the website.

**Comments of Bob Cooper:** - Mr. Cooper stated that when looking at 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue vacation consideration might be given to moving development to the west and creating a much larger setback between the new hospital development and properties to the west. This area should continue to function as the buffer between the medical and residential development. Looking at 16<sup>th</sup> – pedestrian safety is very important and essential. Pedestrian through access is very important as is better signage. I would like to see a clear identification of entrances, which I believe is very important.

I would like it confirmed that everything will be related to Swedish or Swedish function. That seems different than in the past as the various medical office buildings were seen as a part of a research facility not the hospital. He suggested that there be some definition concerning what is considered functionally related to the role of the hospital.

**Response:** Marcia reaffirmed that there is no policy change. It will be all part of the NeuroScience Institute. There was a presentation made by Dr. Lewis that summarizes the vision of additional services for this campus. It is available online in the Swedish website.

**Comments of Jerry Matsui** – Mr. Matsui stated that he lives on 19<sup>th</sup> avenue. He expressed concern over the proposed height along the eastern boundary. The proposed height is increased from 37 feet to up to 90 feet. It would essentially be a two block long 90 foot high wall looming over the adjacent single family residence. He agreed with Mr. Cooper that the

development be pushed to the west and stepped down towards the single family. I would like know a change on how to load the facility because the way it is currently designed is like a concrete mausoleum. He also stated that greater open space is needed and offered the opinion that this might be an appropriate use for the property along the east side of 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

**Comments of Vicki Schianterelli** – Ms. Schianterelli noted that in the prior plans green space was given up in exchange for decreased height. She asked how SMC would propose to meet the MIO open space standards. Green space is required and crucial. She also stated that open space between the boundary of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> is particularly important. The rear yards of properties along the west side of 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue are used for gardening and other activities by residents. If the 90 foot buildings were built these activities would be greatly compromised.

**Comments of Ken Torp** – Mr. Torp stated that he lives on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue between Cherry and Jefferson. He noted that all of the alternatives propose the vacation of 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue and to many of us this vacation is not acceptable. Much of the discussion has been how to put lipstick on this pig. We need to first figure out whether the vacation is acceptable, necessary and required. All of the options also contain a kind of finger thrust up the rear of the neighborhood only because the property is owned by Sabey. This is unacceptable. This should be taken off and kept at the underlying zoning. We are looking at the fundamental issues of size bulk and scale. Looking at small designed details only takes away from this focus.

**Comments of Ellen Sollod:** Ms. Sollod stated that she served on the SU Major Institution Master Plan committee. She stated that is early in the process to be discussing details as the major elements have not been determined yet. You also need to understand that any street vacation has to balance out the function of the street that the city relies on. All functions of the street have to be accommodated, not only by Swedish. I would to see a careful analysis and evaluation of the alternatives and how this really fits the needs of Swedish and the neighborhood; think of the big picture. Regarding the comments on the proposals:

- 1) The boundary expansion to the Spencer Technology site is not desirable and does not achieve a significant expansion of square footage.
- 2) The street vacations needs to be carefully analyzed; connectivity is not just about pedestrian access or a 14 foot sidewalk;
- 3) Height should be concentrated on the center of the campus not along the edges;
- 4) Proposed height is too high. 200 ft height should be centered at the center of the campus, not on the edges. She stated that it is important to keep in mind the effect of the proposed heights on properties north of Jefferson street as well as along 19<sup>th</sup>.
- 5) Public access routes need to be open if possible. Going through a hospital or medical building to get a public route is questionable.
- 6) The building program may simply be too ambitious. It is possible that the building program that SMC is proposing is just too large to be accommodated on this site and in this environment. Uses that are not for the hospital functions should be located at a different

Swedish location. Wall along Cherry St. and Cherry St. – analyze the height scale and other aspects of community connectivity.

**Comments of Greg Taplock** – Mr. Taplock stated that he lives on 16<sup>th</sup> and Cherry across the proposed 200 ft. building. The building that is there right now is a flat top building that allows a sweeping city view for every resident that sits behind the site you are proposing to build. Removing this view would be a major loss. He also asked how long the construction plan is. It can go on for a long time. He stated that if this moves forward in the direction of blocking the view; I choose to vote to leave the neighborhood.

**Comments of Larry Malfort:** - Mr. Malfort stated that he wanted to echo Ms. Sollod's comment concerning the importance of not building high on the edges makes sense. If 16<sup>th</sup> is to be vacated for use by emergency vehicles, what is the fate of the existing parking garage? Will parking go somewhere else?

**Response:** Access to the parking garage will be maintained. There will still have parking access as well as pedestrian. An underground access is part of the vacation; because of the grade, that maintains a current issue.

#### **V. Continued Committee Discussion**

Dylan Glosecki stated that he would like to see a breakdown of the 3 million square feet to identify where the square foot would be located in a simple graphic format would be really helpful. He also noted that a park space as a buffer on 18<sup>th</sup> half block between the existing single family houses. He agreed that the focus should remain on the height, bulk and scale. However it is not too early to begin looking at other measures that might mitigate that height, bulk and scale.

Najwa Alsheikh noted that she is nervous on advocating retail because it will eventually lead to an increase noise, traffic, and congestion. She noted that she had negative experiences with retail at other locations. Nicholas Richter noted that the type of retail that might work would be similar to what is presently along 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue near Union. It is a nice place to start looking that primarily serves the community as an example that fits well in the neighborhood. Najwa agreed that the example does fits well with the neighborhood.

Laurel Spelman commented that having six alternatives was a bit overwhelming. Three alternatives are more manageable. I would like to see in the next meeting and might be a good idea having physical model available so everyone can see every angle of the project. Nicholas Richter noted that the same result might be achieved through a 3D model where the committee could manipulate the viewpoints to see it from various perspectives.

Steve Sheppard noted the emphasis on height bulk and scale and the suggestions that the development program identified by SMC might be too large. He noted that under the code SMC proposes the level of development and that this is not negotiated with the committee. That does not mean that the Committee must accept the plan as proposed. The Committee might look at the heights. Bulks and scale of development and the transportation and other impacts and take acceptance to them. It would be up to the institution to propose development standards that could be accommodated. That is the direction the analysis goes, not necessarily stating that the need for development has not been justified.

#### **V. Adjournment**

No further business being before the committee; the meeting was adjourned at 8:15pm